

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to:

Figure 4

Figure 5

The replacement sheets replace handwritten reference numbers with typed reference numbers. No new matter is introduced.

Attachment: Replacement sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1 –25 are pending and have been examined in the Office Action (the “Action”). Claims 14 and 17-22 have been amended.

I. **FORMAL MATTERS**

A. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner’s inclusion in the Action a copy of the PTO forms submitted in the IDS filed on April 7, 2004. The references listed therein are initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that they have been considered and will be listed on the face of any patent that issues from the present application.

B. Drawings

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner’s acceptance of the drawings submitted on January 15, 2004.

Applicant submits replacement sheets for FIGS. 4 and 5 attached herewith. The sheets merely replace handwritten numbers with typed numbers and no new matter is being added as a result of these figures. Applicant requests that these replacement sheets be entered.

II. **REJECTIONS**

A. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 101

The Action rejects claims 17-22 under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 17 - 21

Amended claim 17 recites “a computer program product comprising a storage medium having computer-readable code stored thereon”, and Applicant submits that

amended claim 17 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC § 101 should be withdrawn.

Further, each of claims 18 – 21 depend directly from claim 17 and therefore Applicant submits that rejection of each of these claims under 35 USC § 101 should be withdrawn.

Claim 22

Amended claim 22 recites “a computer program product comprising a storage medium having computer-readable code stored thereon”, and Applicant submits that amended claim 22 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 USC § 101. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC § 101 should be withdrawn.

B. Claim rejections – 35 USC § 102(a)

The Action rejects claims 1-25 under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,567,783 to Notani et al. (“Notani”). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(a) is traversed because Notani fails to teach or suggest a computerized method for collaborating over a network to manipulate a design using a plurality of heterogeneous user applications running on respective clients connected to the network, the method including the steps of:

loading design data representing the design into a local application running on the client;

creating at least one application state file representing at least one application state of the local application based on at least one manipulation of the design using the local application;

communicating the at least one application state file from the session client process to the other session client processes via the session manager; and,

loading at least one application state file created by other local applications and communicated from the other session clients via the session manager.

Notani describes a publish/subscribe communication model (see Notani, col. 15, lines 17 – 32 and FIG. 14). The model includes an event manager which is in communication with a plurality of subscriber GUI/applications. The event manager is in further communication with a workflow module running a workflow. The workflow includes workflow events, for example, a group of activities strung together in various configurations (see Notani, col. 15, lines 37-38).

In one example of the publish/subscribe communication model described in Notani, a first GUI/application sends an event to the event manager (see Notani, col. 15, lines 23 – 32). The event manager passes the event to the workflow module. In response to the event, the workflow module may execute a new workflow. The new workflow may trigger a second event, which is passed to the event manager. The event manager then notifies subscriber GUI/applications (in communication with the event manager) that the second event occurred in the workflow. Parameters related to the event may be passed with the event notification.

Notani further describes various communication models, for example, hub-to-spoke and hub-to-hub models (see Notani, col. 17, starting at line 3). In the hub-to-spoke model example, the spoke may be a web browser and web page or applet and the hub may be a web application. The web applet can be centrally designed and deployable to the remote spokes. The model can further accommodate versioning control of the web page or applet.

Notani does not teach or suggest the application state files recited in claim 1. The application state files represent the manipulations of design data loaded in a local

application (see application as-filed, paragraph [0019]). For example, manipulations of the design data can include view-type manipulations, including zooming, panning, changing of display units, visibility, coloring, and highlighting of the data (see application as-filed, paragraph [0021]). Manipulations can also include data object-type manipulations, including adding layers, object classes, object components, design pins, design nets, and design test points. Id.

A local application can create the application state file and communicate the file to other local applications, which can load and view the communicated application state file and collaboratively view the design data manipulations. This can greatly facilitate real-time collaboration over a network because only the manipulated portion of the design data needs to be encoded in the application state file (see application as-filed, paragraph [0021]).

The events described in Notani are different than the application state files recited in claim 1. The events cannot represent application states of design data loaded in a local application (see above). At most, the events include parameters related to the event, not design data manipulations (see Notani, col. 15, lines 30 – 31). Further, unlike the application state files, the events are not created and communicated after design data is manipulated in a local application.

Further, Notani does not describe loading design data representing a design as recited in claim 1. Instead, Notani describes passing events from a workflow module triggered in the workflow, which may include event parameters (see above). Passing events from a workflow module triggered in the workflow is not the same as loading design data representing a design.

In addition, Notani merely describes generating and passing events. Notani does not describe creating at least one application state file representing at least one application state of a local application based on at least one manipulation of a design using the local application as recited in claim 1. The events could not be used to represent an application state of the local application based on a manipulation of a design.

Notani describes passing events and generating other events in a separately executing workflow module. The other events are passed to subscriber GUI/applications (see above). Because Notani does not describe application state files, Notani does not describe communicating at least one application state file from one client process to another client process.

Notani cannot describe loading at least one application state file created by other local applications and communicated from other clients because Notani does not describe application state files (see above). Instead, Notani describes passing the event between a workflow module and subscriber GUI/applications via an event manager.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Notani does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Notani and that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 – 10

Each of claims 2 – 10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection of each of claims 2 -10 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 11 – 13

The Action rejects claim 11 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, each of claims 12 and 13 depend directly from claim 11, and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons.

Claims 14 – 16

The Action rejects claim 14 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, each of claims 15 and 16 depend directly from claim 14, and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons.

Claims 17- 21

The Action rejects claim 17 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, each of claims 18 - 21 depend directly from claim 17, and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons.

Claim 22

The Action rejects claim 22 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 23

The Action rejects claim 23 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 24 – 25

The Action rejects claim 24 in a corresponding manner to claim 1 above (see the Action, page 7). Thus, at least for the same reasons as described above, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 USC § 102(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, claim 25 depends directly from claim 24, and is therefore patentable at least for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
By 
Ralph A. Loren
Registration No.: 29,325
Steven Cohen
Registration No.: 59,503
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02199-7613
(617) 239-0233
Attorneys For Applicant

Attachments:
Replacement Sheets